FILED 1 Edson Camacho 350 Paloma Court 2008 JUN 13 P 3 15 2 Martinez, CA 94553 (510) 853-4462 RICHARD W. WIERING Defendant pro se 3 U.S. DISTRICT COUR NO DIST. OF CA. SL 4 Osvaldina Lima 350 Paloma Court 5 Martinez, CA 94553 (510) 853-4462 Defendant pro se 6 7 8 United States District Court Northern Bistrict of California NICHOLAS ROBLES, 10 No. C 08 997 PVT 11 Plaintiff, ANSWER TO COMPLAINT vs. 12 Edson Camacho, Osvaldina Lima, et al. 13 Defendants. 14 15 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT Defendants Camacho and Lima answer the complaint as follows: 1. Defendants admit the allegations of paragraphs 3 and 4 of the complaint. 2. In response to paragraphs 12, 14, 21, 35, 47, and 48 of the complaint, defendants admit only the language of the statutes cited and deny the balance of those paragraphs. 3. Defendants are without sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations of paragraphs 2 and 10 of the complaint. 4. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraphs 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53 of the complaint. 5. Defendants reiterate their answers to the paragraphs incorporated into paragraphs 19, 28, 33, 38, and 46 of the complaint.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

6. Defendants deny any other allegation in the complaint not specifically responded to

1	above.
2	Wherefore, defendants pray that this court dismiss the complaint with prejudice and
3	award them their costs and such other relief as the court may find proper.
4	
5	6-12-2008 Hom.
6	Date Edson Camacho
7	
8	6-09-2008 Unaldina Lina
9	Date Osvaldina Lima
10	Defendants pro se
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2
	Answer to Complaint